

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE VEDIC POSTERIUS -PITVAM, COVER (NIGHT)

EDWIN W. FAY

University of Texas

The words prapitvám, āpitvám, and abhipitvám must all be compounds, and their analysis as such is very simple. terius -pitvam, quasi 'tectum,' is derived from the root Po(I) '(pro-) tegere,' but in Greek πωμα we have the concrete sense of 'lid, cover.' From the sense of 'cover' -pitvam developed the sense of 'night.' The conception is familiar. We have in Isaiah (60. 2), 'Darkness shall cover the earth.' Shakespeare may be cited for 'Night is fled, Whose pitchy mantle over-veil'd the earth'; and for 'Well cover'd with the night's black mantle.' In the Iliad (5. 23) Homer has the same figure. Prellwitz is undoubtedly right when, in his Greek lexicon, he connects σκέπας 'shelter,' generalized from 'cover,' with Skr. ksáp, Av. xšap 'night.' In Skr. abhi-pitvám 'evening' and ā-pitvám (cf. Av. ă-xšapan- 'evening twilight') we have the sense of 'sub noctem' (close to night), while pra-pitvám (cf. pra-dosám 'at eve'), which originally meant 'ante noctem' (=twilight), was allocated, thanks to the frequent connotation of pra- in other time words ($\pi \rho \omega t$ 'mane'), to the sense of 'morning twilight.' These words are cognate with Lat. o-pā-cus, dark, shadowy (see JAOS 34. 336, n. 1).

In $\bar{a}pitv\acute{a}m$ we have the IE. preverb $\bar{\mathbf{E}}$, which I am always disposed to speak of as Brugmann's $\bar{\mathbf{E}}$ (see $Gr. 2. 2, \S 634$). In spite of all the exaggerated use to which Brugmann puts it, as in $\tilde{\eta}\pi\iota\sigma$ s (l. c.), its reality is not to be doubted.

To get the Vedic usage of pra-pitvám settled right I have consulted, besides the lexica, the versions of Griffith, Ludwig, and Grassmann. Ludwig, who etymologizes prapitvám on Lat. prope 'near,' translates everywhere as if in terms of propinquitas or appropinquatio. This erroneous definition seems supported by

 $^{^{1}}$ Cf. AJP 27. 308, n. 2, in which I refer to Bloomfield's different explanation of $pitv\acute{a}.$

RV. 3. 53. 24, where the seer is eulogizing the prowess of the Bharatas, famed as horsemen. He says:

apapitvám cikitur ná prapitvám

and Ludwig, in common with all other authorities, renders by 'These Bharatas think < not > on the far and not on the near.' This is erroneous. The sense is: 'They reck of uncovering (i. e. open fight) and not of cover (fighting behind ramparts).'—In 5. 31. 7, which relates the slaving of Susna, demon of drouth, by Indra, where Griffith renders prapitvám yánn by 'drawing nigh' (Ludwig's 'zu leibe ihm gehend' is not meant to be different), even Grassmann renders by 'vorwärts-eilend.' The phrase means in propugnaculum <hostile> iens, said of Indra advancing upon the hiding place of the demon. Note Skr. pā-tāla-m, underground hiding or residence of serpents or demons.-In three passages (1. 189. 7; 4. 16. 12; 7. 41. 4), thanks in two of them to construction with the genitive of the word for 'day.' Ludwig's versions, harmonizing with Grassmann's and Griffith's, imply 'at dawn.' In all the passages where Griffith recognizes 'prope' Grassmann, to the improvement of the sense, admits 'dawn.' In 1. 104. 1, vástor . . . prapitvé either means 'luci . . . mane' (tautological), or 'at dawn of morn.'—In 10. 73. 2, as Grassmann sees, dhvāntāt prapitvāt means 'ex tenebricosa mane.'—In 4. 16. 12, the slaving of Susna at dawn (prapitvé áhnah 'beim nahen des tages,' Ludwig) is admitted by all the translators. We can hardly refuse in 6, 31, 3, in a description of the same act, to render prapitvé alone by 'mane'; and even in 5. 31. 7, prapitvám yánn, prapitvám (acc.; cf. pradosám 'at eve') may be used in the sense of 'mane.' My results for prapitvám are that in RV. 3. 53. 24 and 5. 31. 7 it means 'hiding. shelter, cover'; in all other cases it means 'twilight,' from 'cover of night,' with a general, but not exclusive, application to the morning twilight. In recasting the definitions of the second Petersburg lexicon, viz. (1) abitus, (2) fuga, (3) recessus, (4) vesper, we must start from original 'protectus,' with connotation of (a) 'recessus' and (b) 'shelter of the night, twilight' (in RV. 8. 1. 29, see below); generally, but not exclusively, 'morning.' The senses 'fuga' (receptus) and 'abitus' are mere nuances of 'recessus.'

Excursus on the sept of English evening.

In his entry under Germ. abend Kluge writes as pre-Germanic primates (1) ēpntó-; (2) ēptón-, in O.Norse aptann; (3) ēptén-, in O.Eng. afen. No cognates out of the Teutonic group have ever been pointed out. The Rig Veda has a clear cognate, however, in āpitvám 'evening.'

The first explanation would be to derive all the cognates from the root EP. This appears as ∂P in Latin apere, 'to bind' (pf. $co-\bar{e}pi$), and I have before now thought of 'night' as the 'binder,' cf. Νὺξ δμήτειρα $\theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}\nu$... καὶ ἀνδρ $\hat{\omega}\nu$ (Iliad 14. 259).

A second definition, cleaving still to the root $\bar{E}P$, is suggested by the fact that the Greeks, in the word $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \phi \rho \dot{\nu} \nu \eta$ (Hesiod), designated night as the 'kindly' time. Accordingly, Skr. $\bar{a}pi$ -tvám would lend itself to explanation as an abstract to $\bar{a}pi$ -s 'verbündeter, freund,' certainly cognate with Homeric $\mathring{\eta}\pi \iota \sigma s^2$ 'friendly.' The root $\bar{E}P$ 'to bind' is certain in $\mathring{\eta}\pi \eta \tau \dot{\eta} s$, 'mender'; cf., with the $\check{\sigma}$ -grade, the synonymous $\check{\sigma}\pi \dot{\eta}\tau \rho \iota a$.

Neither of these definitions seems admissible on account of Skr. abhi-pitvám and pra-pitvám, which latter, combined with the adjective api-śarvará-m 'verging on night' (applicable both to morning and evening), does mean 'evening' once (RV. 8. 1. 29), but elsewhere, when a time word, means 'morning.' This all the lexicographers and translators of the Rig Veda have seen, save only the great authority of the second Petersburg Lexicon (followed by Monier Williams), which here has gone wrongmisled, I take it, by the instance with apisarvaré (locative). This was because apiśarvaré usually means 'at dawn' (Lat. mane). The truth is that api- in the compound signified 'close to'; cf. Lat. sub, used to mean 'just before' in sub noctem, but also 'just after' in sub luce < m >, cf. the note of Weissenborn-Müller on Livy 25. 24. 7. But it also means that pra-pitvám originally meant 'twilight,' but was subsequently allocated to the dawn, thanks to the syllable pra- 'before,' cf. Skr. prātár and pra-ge 'mane.'

² Lest, misguided by Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2. 616, one divide η - $\pi \iota \iota \iota s$ and go on to connect with Lat. pius, let me note that pius is properly to be explained, after Wiedemann, as 'protecting' (AJP 37. 172); while the verb piare means 'to offer fat' (ib. 162).

After this necessary explanation of Skr. ā-pitvám and -pitvam, quasi 'night,' let us return to our Indo-European primates.

- (1) \bar{e} -p- $nt\dot{o}$ is a compound, with reduction of π in composition to zero (see Bartholomae's rule in IF 7. 70; 10. 197), of $E + P\pi$ -NTO. In PM-NTO- we have the extension of a participle PM-NT-(: $P\bar{0}$:: Lat. dant: $D\bar{0}$) by the declension exponent o. Cf. with strong stem Skr. $p\dot{a}nta$ 'potion,' from the homonymous root $P\bar{0}I$, type of Lat. ventus 'wind,' Skr. $d\dot{a}nta$ -: $d\dot{a}nt$ 'tooth.'
- (2) $\bar{e}pt\acute{e}n-/\bar{e}pt\acute{o}n-$, wherein PH is again reduced in composition to p. For the suffix TEN see the data in Brugmann's Grundriss 2. 1, §222.
- (3) Epitvóm in Skr. $\bar{a}pitv\acute{a}m$ contains in pi the weakest vocalism of the root $p\bar{o}i$. With -tvom cf. the cognate suffix in Goth. $\bar{u}h$ -tw \bar{o} 'dawn' and in Skr. $v\acute{a}s$ -tu- 'morning.'